Membership:

Provide the most recent membership numbers.
Number of Members: 1743

List any factors you think may be increasing or decreasing your Section membership.
The Board continues to monitor membership trends, both in light of the current economic climate and the increased burden on membership fees given the move to Anthrosourse. The membership and subscription reports provided by AAA show that SCA and its journal, *Cultural Anthropology*, are remarkably strong. 2012 was, once again, a record-breaking year for membership, with our ranks growing to 1,743 as of October 2012 (up from 1,673 a year ago). At the close of 2011, we had a total of 1,724 members. Our membership always increases in the years when we have the SCA spring conference. But other strategies seem to have been successful as well. We now offer multiple categories of membership. We dropped the student rate $12.50 and launched an email outreach campaign to students in advance of the AAA. And we have carried forward a variety of promotional initiatives: membership drives, email blasts, student workshops, and a well-regarded book prize. We can also attribute this success to our growth in programming, with the impending launch of our new joint SCA/CA website. (See below.) In the past, we have discussed the possibility of requiring those who submit to our journal to become member; this is not a measure we have yet taken. Our new website now includes features that encourage even more potential members to join. There seem to be two possible models of membership for the SCA and other sections – the country club model – where one must join to participate – and the public radio model – where one joins because one feels an affinity to the group. So far, the latter model seems to be working quite well.

Finances:

Provide the most recent financial balances for Section budgets (and publication sponsored budgets).

Financial Balance: 193,455.37

Publication Sponsored budgets.

| Section Dues Subsidy | $41,885.06 |
Subtotal - Dues Revenue (see Note 1) 41,885.06

W-B Royalty 31,048.53

TOTAL REVENUE 72,933.59

EXPENDITURES:

Academic Editorial Office 72,408.34
Storage 525.25

Subtotal Print Publication Expense 72,933.59

List any factors you think are affecting your Section's finances.

Our overall net balance has been healthy and grew for over a decade through 2010. Our royalty from the Wiley-Blackwell contract for 2012 (as of Oct 31, 2012) was over $31,000, which exceeds our budgeted projection. As in prior years, we remain concerned about what the future holds for SCA’s financial health as academic publishing moves towards new models. We also remain eager to receive more detailed information on our journal’s production costs and revenues. These issues will become increasingly important in the future, now that we have begun to spend down our fund balance by expanding the scope and nature of what SCA offers its membership and the public at large.

Over the last few years, the SCA Board has consciously determined to draw down our fund balance, on the principle that section assets—especially insofar as a section charges membership dues—should be used rather than banked. This decision accounts for the overall decline in our net fund balance from $227,849.22 on January 1, 2012 to $193,455.37 (as of December 1, 2012). In part, this decline in funds reflects the expense of our Spring Conference, which cost us a net loss of $30,866.91 (roughly equivalent to the royalty we receive from W-B). As the report describe below, these conferences represent one of the principle benefits to our members, and - while costly – have been expenses we feel are easily justified. The breadth of programming and the opportunities our conference provides have made them tremendously popular. At the same time, we are mindful of the fact that we will have to set tighter limits on these expenditures going forward, especially given the other expenses we have taken on. Since 2011, we have devoted significant resources to expanding our on-line presence through a new website that is now home to both the journal and the society. (See below.) The total cost to SCA of the website in 2012 was $37,916.53. We also continue to pay our program director a salary of $46,800 for the combined managing editor/program director job. (We arranged for this appointment to be made through Duke University, so that we can provide benefits. Given the increased responsibilities associated with the position, we were eager to make it a viable career choice for whoever fills it.) The program director has been, and continues to be responsible for managing this new initiative and overseeing the editorial intern program, which will be directly involved in the project. Needless to say, these are significant fixed costs; we will be assessing the viability of our management model for this project on a yearly basis.
Sessions:
List the titles of your Section's AAA meeting invited sessions, co-sponsored sessions, and any special events your Section sponsored or in which it participated.

Session Type: Special Events
Session: Culture@Large ?On Biopolitics and the Attachment to Life?

Session Type: Invited
Session: ?WARFARE AND HEALTHCARE: ACTION AT A DISTANCE AND BODIES IN CONTACT,?

Session Type: Invited
Session: ENDURING IN THE VERGE: BEING WITH OTHERS IN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE SOCIAL

Session Type: Invited
Session: INDEBTED: THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL CALCULUS OF OBLIGATION AND FORGIVENESS

Session Type: Special Events
Session: Editorial Intern Meeting

Awards
List awards presented this year on behalf of your Section.

Award: Cultural Horizons Prize
Date: 11/16/2012
Recipient: Mette N. Svendsen
Affiliation: University of Copenhagen
Project/Paper/Accomplishment: Articulating Potentiality: Notes on the Delineation of the Blank Figure in Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research

Award: Gregory Bateson Book Prize
Date: 11/16/2012
Recipient: David Graeber
Affiliation: Goldsmith's, UCL
Project/Paper/Accomplishment: Debt. The First 5,000 Years

Meetings
Did your section request a meeting registration waiver or community engagement grant?
No
If granted, who/what was it/they used for?
Incomplete
List spring meeting activities
Our biannual conference, “Life and Death: A Conversation,” was held on May 11-12, 2012 at the Providence Biltmore Hotel in Providence, Rhode Island. The organizers, Jennifer Cole, Peter Redfield, and Danilyn Rutherford, encouraged submissions that experiment with the traditional conference formula, seeking out panels that take the form of conversations among viewpoints as opposed to isolated papers. In line with this model, the plenary sessions all took the form of a dialogue between pairs of scholars: Laura Bear and Gillian Feeley-Harnik, Erica Bornstein and Ilana Feldman, Lawrence Cohen and Eric Fassin. João Biehl and Vinh-Kim Nguyen presented the David Schneider Memorial Lecture, in line with our effort to showcase younger practitioners in our field.

The conference itself was a real success. The organizers, Jennifer Cole, Peter Redfield, and Danilyn Rutherford, reviewed over 200 submissions. A total of 139 people appeared on the program, which featured twenty-two sessions, each with roughly five presenters. We also held a well-attended round-table on “Work, Lives, and Death in Alternative Careers,” and the photo-essay, “Life and Death on Fragile Ground: A Photo-Essay and Guided Expedition from New Orleans to the Birdfoot Delta.” SCA received a total of $4,540 in registration fees before and during the conference, as well as $475 in sponsor fees, for a total of $5015 in revenue.

For a description of the conference and the full program, see http://sca.culanth.org/meetings/sca/2012/intro.html and http://sca.culanth.org/meetings/sca/2012/program.html.

Preparations are already beginning for the next SCA Spring Conference.

**Mentorship:**

*Mentorship efforts (at or beyond the AAA meetings) to any of the following (e.g., special activities, funding, awards, guidance/advising on professional matters, etc.)*

**Undergraduate and/or graduate students.**

SCA was among the first sections to introduce a voting Student Caucus representative to its full-time board. With help from Grant Otsuki (Toronto), we, once again, offered Student Faculty Mentoring Workshops at the AAA in San Francisco. Faculty members associated with SCA met with groups of students working on topics of shared interest over lunch in the conference hotel. See


Our journal’s editorial intern program remains an important avenue for mentoring our student members. Drawn from graduate programs around the country, our editorial interns have produced “Curated Collections” of virtual issues that provide additional content and
teaching suggestions related to a series of thematically related articles.

Some Curated Collections include:

http://production.culanth.org/curated_collections/11-infrastructure

and

http://production.culanth.org/curated_collections/5-literature-writing-anthropology

Early career scholars.
not applicable

Independent scholars.
not applicable

Outreach:

Additional outreach efforts (at or beyond the AAA meetings) to other sections, interest groups, and scholarly societies, government agencies, public education/community engagement, and underrepresented minorities.
Our new website is described in detail under "Communications"

Communications:

Status and use of Section internal communications such as a website, list serve, or newsletter (if applicable): Please list internal communication tools you use and what they are used for.

Internal Communications

SCA runs an active Listserve with approximately 2000 subscribers. We limit email flow to approximately 20 messages per year, focusing on public section events. The website is in active use.

New Forms of Scholarly Communication

As noted above, SCA’s major project for 2012 was the preparation of a state-of-the art joint SCA/Cultural Anthropology website, which explores new venues and forms of scholarly conversation, from video of conference proceedings to short thought pieces on breaking events to online discussions of emerging topics and themes in the discipline. The new website [ http://production.culanth.org/] integrates the current SCA and CA websites, and has four main sections:
The Journal section houses most of what is available through the current journal website -- supplemental pages, theme and area lists, curated collections, information about the journal and the intern program.

The Society section includes all of the content available through the current SCA site.

A Site Guide that provides visitors with information regarding the site and how to use it. Here, visitors can learn about journal article submission, available teaching tools, etc.

Fieldsights, our new blog, emerged out of the committee’s desire to expand our modes of communication and scholarly exchange. In addition to being used for SCA and CA announcements, Fieldsights houses the following new features:

Episcope – a current events blog, with anthropologists weighing in on contemporary issues of pressing concern.

Fieldnotes – an ongoing conversation around fieldwork and the research process.

Anthro Happenings – snapshots of people, places, and events from the SCA/CA community.

From the Editors – announcements about new journal content – from the print issue, the archives, and Wiley Blackwell’s promotion office.

Hot Spots – a forum that reports on current “hot spots” around the world from the perspective of anthropologists and others on the scene.

Visual and New Media Review – a blog that reviews emerging work at the intersection of cultural anthropology and visual/new media.

SCA News – our section’s monthly column in Anthropology News.

Our editorial team hired a web designer to work on the new website in collaboration with us throughout 2012. The site (which remains a bit of a work in progress, like all websites)
launched in November, just before the AAA. We are thrilled with the results!

Finally, the leadership of the SCA spent a good deal of time this Fall considering the proposal, floated by Oona Schmid, offering the possibility for one section journal to convert to Open Access for the remainder of the Wiley-Blackwell contract. Of course, many members of the AAA have been excited about the prospect of converting to some model of Open Access, so this was an intriguing possibility. At the same time, the conversion terms offered come with a number of costs, including some highly unpredictable ones. Given the complexities of this decision, and the range of issues entailed, we asked Oona for more time to make the decision, so that the Board could meet face-to-face before deciding; and, further, we convened a Task Force that could help us to reach a fully informed decision on this question.

That Task Force included of Anne Allison, Charlie Piot, Jessica Cattelino, Ali Kenner, Kim Fortun, Chris Kelty, and Brad Weiss as members. We had a number of exchanges and discussions (including one with Oona) on this matter, with a charge to make a recommendation to the Board about how to respond to this memo/proposal. Ultimately, the Task Force had a vigorous discussion, and recommended to the Board that we take up this offer, and submit a proposal to the AAA Executive Board requesting permission to convert to Open Access. The SCA approved this recommendation, and we submitted our proposal in mid-December. We are concerned, to some extent, about the unpredictable nature of the costs we might assume in this process; but we are convinced that the AAA as a whole needs to explore alternative publishing models, and needs hard data upon which to draw conclusions about how to make Open Access a viable means of disseminating scholarly knowledge. We are excited about the prospects of this conversion in 2014, and look forward to working with other sections in sharing the resources we have developed and making Open Access work for our authors, members, and readers.

Governance:
Changes in bylaws or governance structure.
Not applicable

Initiatives:
What Initiatives does your Section have underway or planned for the coming year: membership, publication annual meeting, mentorship, other?
1. Open Access

As the preceding item makes clear, we anticipate the need to prepare our journal for conversion to Open Access. We have worked to develop both our own website as a platform for publication, and the OJS system as a means of managing the review process going forward. We anticipate the need to work closely with librarians, as well, in helping to
archive our efforts, and to insure that we can maintain the high profile the CA currently enjoys.

2. Collaboration

SCA has worked to increase collaboration between our student representative and the student representatives from other AAA sections, who have exchanged information and announcements regarding upcoming events. We also hope to use these collaborations as a means to facilitate a productive discussion about alternative publishing models.

3 Editorial Search

We have already begun the process of searching for the next editors of Cultural Anthropology. That selection process will be completed at our Spring meeting in May.

Ask AAA:
Please tell us what your chief concerns and issues are, especially if they are not previously noted.
What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the Section Assembly Executive Committee (SAEC)? Please be specific.
Concerns and Recommendations

• SCA urges an evaluation of the registration fees charted for attending the annual meeting. The cost of registration is prohibitive to non-AAA members. This makes it very difficult for SCA to sponsor the kind of interdisciplinary conversations SCA has long sought to foster. We would welcome any information the EB can provide on the costs and benefits of the current system. A survey of the way other professional societies structure registration fees could provide useful comparative insight and a sense of best practices. We have raised this issue in the past, and feel it continues to merit discussion.

• We have raised questions with the Publications Office about the fee structure entailed in the current AAA Author’s Agreement. Our investigations with a number of publishers suggest that these fees are both onerous, and outside of the standard charges for scholarly associations. We hope these fees can be reconsidered, and would like to have more communication with the Board and the Publications Office on the matter.

• In general, we remain concerned about the governance structure of the AAA as a whole, and the transparency of its decision making processes, in particular. It has been difficult to
get information about such major decisions as the Open Access proposal, or the author agreement fees, from either the staff or the Executive Board. In particular, we are concerned that the democratically elected members of the Board have not been informed of proposals that have come to the sections when we have sought their counsel on these matters. If the sections are to work together on the pressing issues we all face, then transparency of communication is not only an ethical obligation, it is a minimal requirement of good governance which the AAA needs to address.

• SCA urges a more active role on the part of the Section Assembly and AAA Staff to make use of the Student Caucus. Graduate students can play a central role enhancing the vitality of the AAA and its programs.

• SCA urges the Executive Board to play a stronger role in considering alternatives to the current AAA publishing arrangement. As in past years, we are eager to see the AAA leadership think creatively about alternative models. As we have continued to note, libraries at our home institutions bear the cost of the current contract. So do our students and staff at public universities, who end up shouldering the burden of budget shortfalls through tuition hikes, furloughs, and lay-offs. Advances in technology are leading to changes in scholarly publishing that bear on the very nature and raison d’être of professional organizations like ours. We are pleased that Open Access has been raised as a possibility, and offered as a “pilot” project; we feel that more discussion of additional alternatives remains needed.

• As President, I HATE this new portal!! I would much prefer to submit a written report that captures the cohesive character of our activities—this is too disjointed, and the reason for the change—like so many governance issues—is opaque.

What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the AAA Executive Board? Please be specific.

Concerns and Recommendations

• SCA urges an evaluation of the registration fees charted for attending the annual meeting. The cost of registration is prohibitive to non-AAA members. This makes it very difficult for SCA to sponsor the kind of interdisciplinary conversations SCA has long sought to foster. We would welcome any information the EB can provide on the costs and benefits of the current system. A survey of the way other professional societies structure registration fees could provide useful comparative insight and a sense of best practices. We have raised this issue in the past, and feel it continues to merit discussion.

• We have raised questions with the Publications Office about the fee structure entailed in the current AAA Author’s Agreement. Our investigations with a number of publishers suggest that these fees are both onerous, and outside of the standard charges for scholarly associations. We hope these fees can be reconsidered, and would like to have more communication with the Board and the Publications Office on the matter.
In general, we remain concerned about the governance structure of the AAA as a whole, and the transparency of its decision making processes, in particular. It has been difficult to get information about such major decisions as the Open Access proposal, or the author agreement fees, from either the staff or the Executive Board. In particular, we are concerned that the democratically elected members of the Board have not been informed of proposals that have come to the sections when we have sought their counsel on these matters. If the sections are to work together on the pressing issues we all face, then transparency of communication is not only an ethical obligation, it is a minimal requirement of good governance which the AAA needs to address.

SCA urges a more active role on the part of the Section Assembly and AAA Staff to make use of the Student Caucus. Graduate students can play a central role enhancing the vitality of the AAA and its programs.

SCA urges the Executive Board to play a stronger role in considering alternatives to the current AAA publishing arrangement. As in past years, we are eager to see the AAA leadership think creatively about alternative models. As we have continued to note, libraries at our home institutions bear the cost of the current contract. So do our students and staff at public universities, who end up shouldering the burden of budget shortfalls through tuition hikes, furloughs, and lay-offs. Advances in technology are leading to changes in scholarly publishing that bear on the very nature and raison d’être of professional organizations like ours. We are pleased that Open Access has been raised as a possibility, and offered as a “pilot” project; we feel that more discussion of additional alternatives remains needed.

As President, I HATE this new portal!! I would much prefer to submit a written report that captures the cohesive character of our activities- this is too disjointed, and the reason for the change - like so many governance issues - is opaque.

What issues would you like raised or recommendations would you like to make to the AAA Staff? Please be specific.

Concerns and Recommendations

SCA urges an evaluation of the registration fees charted for attending the annual meeting. The cost of registration is prohibitive to non-AAA members. This makes it very difficult for SCA to sponsor the kind of interdisciplinary conversations SCA has long sought to foster. We would welcome any information the EB can provide on the costs and benefits of the current system. A survey of the way other professional societies structure registration fees could provide useful comparative insight and a sense of best practices. We have raised this issue in the past, and feel it continues to merit discussion.

We have raised questions with the Publications Office about the fee structure entailed in the current AAA Author’s Agreement. Our investigations with a number of publishers...
suggest that these fees are both onerous, and outside of the standard charges for scholarly associations. We hope these fees can be reconsidered, and would like to have more communication with the Board and the Publications Office on the matter.

• In general, we remain concerned about the governance structure of the AAA as a whole, and the transparency of its decision making processes, in particular. It has been difficult to get information about such major decisions as the Open Access proposal, or the author agreement fees, from either the staff or the Executive Board. In particular, we are concerned that the democratically elected members of the Board have not been informed of proposals that have come to the sections when we have sought their counsel on these matters. If the sections are to work together on the pressing issues we all face, then transparency of communication is not only an ethical obligation, it is a minimal requirement of good governance which the AAA needs to address.

• SCA urges a more active role on the part of the Section Assembly and AAA Staff to make use of the Student Caucus. Graduate students can play a central role enhancing the vitality of the AAA and its programs.

• SCA urges the Executive Board to play a stronger role in considering alternatives to the current AAA publishing arrangement. As in past years, we are eager to see the AAA leadership think creatively about alternative models. As we have continued to note, libraries at our home institutions bear the cost of the current contract. So do our students and staff at public universities, who end up shouldering the burden of budget shortfalls through tuition hikes, furloughs, and lay-offs. Advances in technology are leading to changes in scholarly publishing that bear on the very nature and raison d’être of professional organizations like ours. We are pleased that Open Access has been raised as a possibility, and offered as a “pilot” project; we feel that more discussion of additional alternatives remains needed.

• As President, I HATE this new portal!! I would much prefer to submit a written report that captures the cohesive character of our activities- this is too disjointed, and the reason for the change - like so many governance issues - is opaque.